

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed August 10, 2004 (Paper No. 91404). Upon entry of this response, claims 1-19 are pending in the application. Applicant respectfully requests that there be reconsideration of all pending claims.

1. Examiner Interview

A telephone interview between the Examiner and one of Applicant's representatives, Karen Hazzah, took place on September 14, 2004. During the interview, the *Dan* reference was discussed with reference to independent claim 1. Although no agreement was reached, Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for his time.

2. Rejection of Claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-19 have been rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Dan* (U.S. 6,560,639) in view of *Pollack* (U.S. 6,505,236). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. It is well established at law that, for a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious based upon a combination of references, the cited combination of references must disclose, teach, or suggest, either implicitly, all elements/features/steps of the claim at issue. *See, e.g., In re Dow Chemical*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In re Keller*, 208 U.S.P.Q.2d 871, 881 (C.C.P.A. 1981).

a. Claim 1

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 1 for at least the following reasons, and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

1) *Dan* does not disclose “searching a database of attachment files previously stored in the e-mail server for a copy of the attachment file from the received e-mail communication”

The Office Action asserts that *Dan* discloses “searching a database” in Col. 11, lines 25-37 and Col. 12, lines 49-57. (Office Action, p. 2, section 4a.) Applicant respectfully disagrees with this characterization of *Dan*. First, *Dan* Col. 12, lines 49-57 does not disclose “searching a database” but rather searching a website: “a user or websurfer may manipulate standard search engines and any standard tools already existing on the web server 20 to search the user’s web site with little or not difference in the performance.” Second, a careful reading of the entire passage cited by the Office Action (Col. 11, lines 25-37) shows that the database in *Dan* stores webpages rather than attachment files: “the web management system 30 may maintain all of the different components, attributes, or meta-data of a web page in the database 50”.

The Office Action further asserts that *Dan* discloses “of attachment files previously stored in the e-mail server for a copy of the attachment file from the received e-mail communication” in Col. 15, line 64 to Col. 16, line 11. (Office Action, p. 2, section 4a.) This passage in *Dan* does contain the word “email,” but is not related to email attachments. Rather, the discussion of email in *Dan* relates to a support system for a website (“Users submit a question as a ‘new article’ and the question is then automatically distributed by email to a number of support experts...The user who pasted the problem may continue the email discussion.”).

The *Dan* reference describes a system for website content management (see Abstract). Claim 1 recites “searching a database of attachment files previously stored in the e-mail server for a copy of the attachment file from the received e-mail communication.” The cited passages in *Dan* do not disclose this limitation of claim 1, nor do any other passages in this reference.

2) *Dan* does not disclose “removing the attachment file from the e-mail communication”

The Office Action asserts that *Dan* discloses “removing the attachment file from the e-mail communication” in Col. 15, lines 10-15 and Col. 25, lines 1-5. (Office Action, p. 2, section 4b.) Applicant respectfully disagrees with this characterization of *Dan*. The two passages in *Dan* cited by the Office Action contain the words “delete” and “attach” but do not disclose “removing the attachment file from the email.” Instead, the two passages relate to removing an interactive posting environment form from a webpage:

Forums may also be attached to pages during site production for team coordination and/or may be managed through an optional Forum Administration component or Forums Manager 100...The Modify Forums form 105 may, for example, enable the user to delete a forum no longer desired. (Col. 15, lines 10-15.)

The *Dan* reference describes a system for website content management (see Abstract). Claim 1 recites “removing the attachment file from the e-mail communication.” The cited passages in *Dan* do not disclose this limitation of claim 1, nor do any other passages in this reference.

3) *Dan* does not disclose “creating a link from the e-mail communication to the previously stored attachment file in the database”

The Office Action asserts that *Dan* discloses “creating a link from the e-mail communication to the previously stored attachment file in the database” in Col. 13, lines 23-40 and Col. 21, lines 33-55. (Office Action, p. 2, section 4c.) Applicant respectfully disagrees with this characterization of *Dan*. The cited passages do not disclose linking an email to an attachment file, but instead describe conventional hyperlinks which link one webpage to another.

The *Dan* reference describes a system for website content management (see Abstract). Claim 1 recites “creating a link from the e-mail communication to the previously stored

attachment file in the database.” The cited passages in *Dan* do not disclose this limitation of claims 1-19, nor do any other passages in this reference.

b. Claim 7

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 7 for at least the following reasons, and request that the rejection be withdrawn. The Office Action alleges that “Claim 7 contains the similar limitations set forth of claim 1. Therefore, claim 7 is rejected for the similar rationale set forth in claim 1.” (Office Action, p. 4, section 10.) Applicant respectfully points out that claim 7 contains limitations that are not present in claim 1 and that are not addressed in the Office Action. For example, *Dan* does not disclose “extracting header information from the attachment file to be stored” as recited in claim 7.

Dan does use the word “header” in Col. 17, lines 20-30. However, this term is defined the same paragraph as “a top portion of a web page.” In contrast, claim 7 recites “extracting header information from the attachment file.” Furthermore, *Dan* describes creating, modifying and deleting headers, but not extracting from headers.

c. Claim 15

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 15 for at least the following reasons, and request that the rejection be withdrawn. *Dan* does not disclose “creating a link from the e-mail communication to the previously stored attachment file in the database.” The Office Action asserts that *Dan* discloses this limitation in Col. 13, lines 23-40 and Col. 21, lines 33-55. (Office Action, p. 6, section 17d.) Applicant respectfully disagrees with this characterization of *Dan*. The cited passages do not disclose linking an email to an attachment file, but instead describe conventional hyperlinks which link one webpage to another.

The *Dan* reference describes a system for website content management (see Abstract).

Claim 15 recites “creating a link from the e-mail communication to the previously stored attachment file in the database.” The cited passages in *Dan* do not disclose this limitation of claim 15, nor do any other passages in this reference.

d. Claims 2-16, 18, and 19

Since claims 1, 7, and 15 are allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-16, 18, and 19 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 2-16, 18, and 19 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests that all outstanding objections and rejections be withdrawn and that this application and presently pending claims 1-19 be allowed to issue. Although some dependent claim rejections and some obviousness rejections are explicitly addressed above, the omission of arguments for other claims is not intended to be construed as an implied admission that the Applicant agrees with the rejection or finding of obviousness for the respective claim or claims. If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding Applicant's response, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone Applicant's undersigned counsel.

Respectfully submitted,

**THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER
& RISLEY, L.L.P.**

By: _____

Jeffrey R. Kuester, Reg. No. 34,367

100 Galleria Parkway, NW
Suite 1750
Atlanta, Georgia 30339-5948
Tel: (770) 933-9500
Fax: (770) 951-0933